

REMARKS

Please find enclosed an amended set of claims.

In claim 18 the term “two structures” in line 1 has been replaced by “a first structure” and “a second structure”. These two terms have already been used in point a) and point c) in claim 18.

Claim 18 has further been amended by introducing the feature that the crane boom is a single-boom as opposed to the boom in Eagles which is a double boom. That the crane boom is a single-boom is clearly shown on figure 1 and figure 5.

Claim 18 has further been amended by naming the trolley which is connected to the receiving terminal of the second structure a “connector trolley”. This name is used for example in paragraph 0028 in the description (*“A connector trolley 15 provides fastening of the boom to the receiving terminal 17...”*).

Claim 18 has further been amended by defining that the connector trolley is fastened to the receiving terminal instead of a connection member in general being connected to the receiving terminal. Basis can be found in the figures and for example in paragraph 0028 of the description (*“A connector trolley 15 provides fastening of the boom to the receiving terminal 17...”*). Paragraph 0030 also states the same.

Finally, points e) and f) of claim 18 have been deleted. The features of point e) have been included in the new claims 26 and 27.

In order to obtain a logical order of the claims, claim 25 has been cancelled and its features included in new claim 28.

Claim 22 and claim 28 (former claim 25) has been amended as suggested by the examiner.

The Examiner has objected to point f) in claim 18. This feature has now been deleted from claim 18.

With the amendments to claim 18 we now believe that the claimed invention would have been non-obvious to a skilled person in art at the priority date.

The crane boom of Eagles is a double-boom. This is clear from the description of Eagles where the crane boom is referred to as a double boom assembly Q, R (see col. 4, line 26), where Q is the main boom (see col. 4, line 32) and R is an auxiliary or linking boom (see col. 4, line 67-68). The linking boom R is pivotably connected to a trolley AH which is adapted to travel along the main boom Q.

The linking boom (which the Examiner regards as a connection member) is pivotably connected to the trolley AH in one end, but cannot, in our view, be considered to be fastened to the second structure as will be further explained below. The fluid conveying pipes in Eagles form part of the linking boom (see col. 5, line 2-5). The end of the linking boom which is not connected to the trolley AH, is supported by a rope system AN. The rope system AN is supported from main boom Q. The linking boom is not connected to the second structure, as can clearly be seen from figures 1 and 3; only the fluid conveying pipes are connected to corresponding fluid conveying pipes of the receiving terminal of the second structure through coupling probes BD and BE. On the opposite sides of the two coupling probes BD and BE, the receivers BF and BG form part of the second structure, i.e. the ship (see col. 5, line 49-53 and figures). This means that the fluid conveying pipes must be designed to take up forces and bending moments created by the relative movements between the two structures.

We would also like to comment that when the system of Eagles is in use, the trolley AH can move relative to the receiving terminal of the second structure. This relative movement can be sideways and/or up and down, i.e. within limits, to any relative position between the trolley AH and the receiving terminal of the second structure. Furthermore, the linking boom has a considerable length. We therefore submit that the trolley AH shown in Eagles cannot be considered to be fastened to the receiving terminal on the second structure when the system is in use.

The claimed invention is a system for transferring fluid between two structures which move relative to each other which is safer and has a simpler construction than the system disclosed in Eagles. Eagles uses a double-boom where the fluid conveying pipes only are connected to the second structure. In bad weather, this is clearly a safety hazard as the fluid conveying pipes and pipe connections may be subjected to large forces and bending moments. The claimed invention uses a single boom comprising a connector trolley which is fastened to

the receiving terminal of the second structure. The resulting connecting joint takes up forces and bending moments due to relative movement between the two structures while the fluid conveying pipes are not subjected to potentially damaging forces and bending moments.

We submit that the system for transferring fluid between two structures which move relative to each other as defined in claim 18 is not disclosed in Eagles. Furthermore, a skilled person in the art could not possibly have arrived at the claimed invention by considering the teaching of Eagles or Eagles in combination with any of the other cited publications.

We therefore believe that the claimed invention as defined in claim 18 would have been non-obvious to a skilled person in the art when the priority application was filed.